

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,430	SAKAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT	1619	

All Participants:

(1) JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT.

(2) RICHARD CHIN.

Date of Interview: 11 August 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

AS OF RECORD

Claims discussed:

AS OF RECORD

Prior art documents discussed:

AS OF RECORD

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/JYOTHSNA A VENKAT /

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1619

Status of Application: Non final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed the attorney that based upon the test results in the specification, application is in condition for allowance limiting component A to amphipathic amide lipid A and amphipathic amide lipid B shown at page 26 of specification and limiting the amount to " 0.1-5 wt % " of component A and limiting B ethylene glycol distearate and the amount to " 0.1 to 5 wt %" and incorporating claims 17 and 18 into claim 1 and limiting cationic polymer to cationic hydroxy ethyl cellulose and cationic guar gum and limiting the ratio of A:B to 1:2 to 1:30 since the amendment of claim 1 limiting the ratio of A:B ranges from 1:1 to 1:30 is new matter and cancelling withdrawn claim 9 since claim 9 is unclear and cancelling claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 17-19 and amending claim 14 from component A to component B since claim 14 is identical to claim 12. Attorney called the examiner the following week and agreed to the amendment and authorized the examiner to amend the claims by examiners amendment.